

LP  
F  
5012

1866

L2



3 9004 01378747 5



THE FEARFUL CONDITION  
OF  
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,  
IN THE  
DIOCESE OF HURON

AS SHOWN IN THE  
Speeches of the Bishop of Huron,

DELIVERED IN THE  
VESTRY OF ST. PAUL'S, LONDON, CANADA WEST,  
ON  
MONDAY, 2<sup>nd</sup> APRIL, 1866.

WITH COMMENTS  
BY HENRY LANDOR, ESQ., M.D.

---

HAMILTON:

PRINTED AT THE SPECTATOR STEAM PRESS, PRINCE'S SQUARE.

1866.



THE FEARFUL CONDITION  
OF  
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,  
IN THE  
DIOCESE OF HURON

AS SHOWN IN THE  
*Speeches of the Bishop of Huron,*

DELIVERED IN THE  
VESTRY OF ST. PAUL'S, LONDON, CANADA WEST,  
ON  
MONDAY, 2<sup>nd</sup> APRIL, 1866.

WITH COMMENTS,  
BY HENRY LANDOR, ESQ., M.D.

---

HAMILTON:  
PRINTED AT THE SPECTATOR STEAM PRESS, PRINCE'S SQUARE.  
1866.

F5012  
1866L2

## VESTRY MEETING.

---

THE BISHOP-RECTOR in the Chair.

After the usual business of the Easter Vestry, the following resolution, of which notice had been given a month previous, was taken into consideration in the fullest Vestry for many years, there being about two hundred people present.

"That in the opinion of this meeting, the welfare of the community requires the resignation of the Rector, and the appointment of a successor who will have both time and inclination to fulfill the duties of his office."





The subject discussed at the Vestry Meeting held in St. Paul's School, London, has excited so much interest throughout the community, that I have determined to publish a full account of the proceedings.

I have left the speeches and remarks of the Bishop and of the other gentlemen who addressed the meeting, just as they came from the short-hand writer's hands, without the slightest alteration of any kind. I have not even attempted to render clearer any statement they have made. They are exactly as reported. With my own speech I have dealt more freely. I have added a point or an argument wherever I thought the statement required further proof or greater strength, and I have appended here and there communications sent to me on the matter then before the Vestry. I have done this in the speech to save unnecessary repetition in the latter portions of the pamphlet.

When I determined to bring the resolution I have quoted above, before the Vestry, I gave the Clerk notice, March 1st, and sent him a copy of the resolution, which I verbally requested him to make known to the Bishop-Rector. I had, on the 17th of January, in a letter on another subject, told the Bishop that I could no longer remain a passive spectator of the religious state of the community under his charge. I took no step that might seem to be directed against him without at once informing him; but it will not surprise those who are acquainted with his general reputation to hear that he met my straightforwardness in every instance, with trickery

I thought that the interest of the subject would be confined to our own church, and therefore, as the time drew near, I wrote to Mr. MacMullen, the apparitor, to ask him for a copy of the list of the pew-holders, to whom I intended to send a notice of the hour of meeting and a copy of the resolu-

tion. He replied that the Bishop had ordered him not to give me a copy. I might have gone to the Vestry Clerk and paid a shilling and obtained a copy, as all the Church-wardens' books are open, by law, to the parishioners on that condition. I took another step: I immediately advertised the matter in all the local papers, and that which might and would have been confined to our own Church, became, by the Bishop's shortsighted act, known to the whole community. The interest it excited is proved by the crowded state of the Vestry, for it attracted two hundred people to the meeting.

Another attempt was made by the Bishop to defeat the motion by unworthy means. The meetings of the Vestry had been held for six years at seven o'clock in the evening. It became rumoured on Saturday, March 31st, that the Vestry on Monday, would be held at half-past ten in the morning. I met the Rev. Mr. Marsh, the Secretary of the Church Society, and asked him if that was the fact. He told me, like the truthful gentleman all know him to be, that it had been so determined. What followed is told in the report of the meeting, and it redounds to the great discredit of the Bishop, for no explanation will free men's minds from the conviction that it was an unworthy attempt to hold the meeting when few could attend it, and thus defeat the publicity it had acquired.

With these few necessary preliminary remarks I proceed to the report of the meeting.

## REPORT.

The Bishop began by saying that he had a desire to address a few words to the congregation relative to matters of interest to the congregation. For fully thirty-three years he had presided over the Vestry meetings, and for the last few years had been relieved of the onerous duties incumbent upon such a position. When he was elected Bishop, the Rectory became vacant. Before he left for England, after his election, there was a large income attainable from the rectory. When he returned, he found it had vanished. Failures in business had reduced it to nothing. The Bishop remarked that the diocese had pledged themselves to provide him with a suitable house, and it was on the condition of that pledge being fulfilled that His Excellency the Governor-General consented that the diocese of Toronto should be divided. When I came back from England, the diocese was not in a position to fulfill that pledge. At the first meeting of the Church Society, after I came back, it was pressed upon me that I should accept the rectory, and continue to hold it until a house was provided. And, after the Church Society of the diocese of Huron was incorporated, at a regular meeting, they placed me in the position again as Rector of St. Paul's, with the understanding that I was to continue the occupation of that rectory till a suitable house was provided, according to the pledge given by the diocese to His Excellency the Governor-General. Since then changes have taken place, though no changes have taken place in one respect, that is, no house has been provided. I urged upon the Synod of the diocese to provide me a house; and in consequence of my urgent request, a committee was appointed to meet with the church-wardens of St. Paul's, to take into consideration the purchase of the house in which I now live. That committee was not successful. The opinion they gave was that it was not desirable to purchase a house for the Rector. At the last meeting but one of the Church Society—which Society is the corporation that holds the purse-strings—I again pressed upon them the necessity of doing something towards providing a house. I felt I was in a position I had no wish to occupy, that is, continuing in the rectory at the same time being Bishop. My duties as Bishop render it utterly impossible for me to discharge any large portion of the

duties of the Rector. My absence from home is almost constant. Therefore, the only thing I could possibly do was to appoint an active man as my substitute ; and it is not necessary for me to say to those present that he has performed the pastoral duties in the parish in the most active and successful manner. (Applause.) I think this will be acknowledged by all. And therefore the wants of the parish are fully provided for by the very excellent, very able and very talented performance of the duties of Rector by the Rev. Mr. McLean. 'This is the position and has been the position so far with regard to the rectory. I have been most anxious that the house should be provided. I repeat, in presence of those now present, that if I possessed means, as I once did, but which I do not now, I would assuredly provide myself a house. There is one thing I would wish to remark regarding my income:—When I entered upon the charge of the rectory, an immense amount of taxes had accumulated upon the property, and the income at that time was exceedingly small in proportion to the burden of taxes upon it. This continued for several years. The lands then began to produce something. From year to year they continued growing slowly, till the income now arrives at something worth naming. My son, who is now present, and who transacts all my business, is, I am happy to say, able to place before the meeting the condition of the income. He is prepared to show what that income was in every year; what expenses were incurred on behalf of the rectory, and what the income now is. I give these explanations ; but, gentlemen, while I do so, I feel that it is not right that I should be put in a position of this kind. I feel that no man has a right to call me to account for anything which is of my own private standing. The rectory was given to me by the legal authorities, and it is my private business so long as I continue in it. Let the diocese do its duty ; let London do its duty (and London has a large duty to perform in the matter) and fulfill the promises given by the diocese at the time that diocese was created. Assuredly it is not for me, at my time of life ; it is not for me, after so many years living and laboring in this country, it is not for me to go around from house to house asking parties (some of whom would be very unwilling to give) the means of providing a house for the diocese. I labored throughout the length and breadth of the diocese once to raise the Episcopal Fund, and surely it should not devolve upon me to go over that work



again and endeavor to raise the two or three thousand dollars necessary for the building of the house. But with respect to my position, as Rector, I would barely suggest to all those who are now present that my position is not at all singular in this respect. In this country and in the neighboring country the thing is of frequent occurrence. The Lord Bishop of Quebec, for more than twenty years was Rector of Quebec, and at the same time occupied the bishopric of Quebec, with a large income. He also lived in the house which was the rectorial house, because there was no other house provided for him by the diocese; and he continued to hold these two positions till his death. The present Bishop of Toronto, while holding the position of Archdeacon and receiving the salary which that office entitled him to receive, at the same time held the office and received the salary of Rector, and he held the office of Rector until a suitable salary was provided for him, and then he resigned. And the other day I was in Detroit, and speaking to the Bishop, he said: "It is only a few months since I ceased to be Rector. I occupied the rectorial house because I had no other house to live in. But lately an episcopal fund in the diocese has been raised, and out of that fund, the excellent, admirable and every way fine house in which I now live, has been built." So that if gentlemen will only consider for a moment the necessities of a new country, they will at once see that it is absolutely necessary for this to occur. Though, as I said before, I am most desirous to be relieved from the duties of Rector; not that I desire to cease to have an interest in the congregation of St. Paul's; although many changes have taken place in that congregation since I first came among them; although many have departed and many are yet departing, still I feel a lively interest in that congregation, and that interest can never cease. But still, at my time of life, I desire very much to be relieved of the duties of Rector; although I must say, that until the diocese performs its duties, until it redeems its pledge to the Governor-General, by providing me with a suitable house to reside in, which shall be the property of the whole diocese, I must continue to hold the rectory. It may be thought unnecessary to make these statements, because a large number of persons have known all these circumstances from the very first; still I think these statements are now necessary, because there are strangers amongst us, strangers are continually coming, who do not know the

circumstances under which the diocese is placed, and thereby may think it strange, may think it rather an anomaly for me to occupy the position of Bishop and Rector at the same time. If there is any person who has anything to advance with reference to my position as Rector, I shall be very happy to hear him now, although it is not strictly in order for this Vestry to take into consideration the rectory, the patronage of which they have nothing to do whatsoever. That is in the hands, where it has been placed by the legal patron, that is, of the Church Society of the diocese.

*Dr. Landor* :—I think that the remarks which the Rector has just addressed to the meeting, would have been a great deal better deferred till after my motion, unless they are meant as an appeal “ad misericordiam.”

*Bishop* :—I must request that in your remarks you will not be personal.

*Dr. Landor* :—I do not consider the remark personal in an offensive sense. If your remarks were not intended to secure beforehand the compassion of the audience, then I am at a loss to know why they were made before my motion was put.

*Bishop* :—Nothing of the kind.

*Dr. Landor* :—Much that you have stated will naturally be replied to in the course of the observations I shall have to make. For much more I am obliged to you, as you have pointed out to me many things to which it will be necessary for me to reply. I am not going to deal with this question as a personal one ; I address no personal remarks against you or anybody else ; but I am certainly going to deal with this subject plainly, as regards the official conduct of the Rector. With regard to your remarks respecting the curate, I most cordially agree. So far as it is possible for a substitute to fulfill the duties of Rector, so far Mr. McLean has worked zealously. (Applause.) Everybody respects his zeal and his energy, and none more than I do, (Applause) although I do not agree with many of his opinions. You say in your remarks, that you thought it was not the office of the vestry to take any notice of your position as Rector. Now, I am not going to call upon the vestry to take any notice of that ; but I am going to call upon the vestry, as the congregation, to express their opinion on the manner in which the

duties of the Rector have been performed, and to express a wish that the duties of the Rector shall be performed in a way they have never yet been in this parish.

It has been said to me by several people since the resolution to be moved by me became known, why do I concern myself in the matter? Why do I not exercise a little prudent selfishness, and abstain from any interference? Well, I say, for my part, I do not believe in such a thing as prudent selfishness. No selfishness can be prudent, whether it belongs to things of a personal or things of a public nature. If such motives had influenced men in former ages, no reforms would ever have been accomplished, more especially no religious or ecclesiastical reforms, which have ever been effected by those who have cast all selfish considerations to the winds, and cared nothing for the troubles or persecutions they might bring upon themselves. Men well know, for it is a proverb that "good christians are very vindictive," that they shall incur all the enmity, "good christians" can display, when they begin to attack religious opinions, and still more when they touch upon religious profits. The resolution, of which I have given notice, expresses an implied fact, and it calls upon this meeting to express an opinion as the congregation of this parish. The fact that it implies is, that the Rector has not performed the duties of Rector of this parish. It declares that they ought to be done, and that they cannot be properly done by the man who occupies two positions, either of which is enough for a young, active and energetic man; and that a man in the decline of life cannot perform the duties of two offices so important as these.—Therefore I ask the congregation to support this resolution, the truth of which they must see every day. Able as the curate may be, no curate can be a substitute for the Rector. What is the position of a Rector in an English parish? In that christian country the Rector is acquainted with every man in the parish; he is a mediator between the rich and the poor; the sympathizer and the soother of those who are sick; every person in the community is his friend; none can come to him, whether rich or poor, without meeting with the kindnesses and charities of his office. He is the cement and link, as it were, of a goodly neighborhood; the healer of divisions, the friend in whose open ears every man may pour his troubles and his sorrows, certain to meet with advice and alleviation, where alleviation is possible. Even with those whose



opinions are not altogether his own he is on terms of friendship and conciliation. On the Sunday he is the incarnation of the common piety of the people, realizing to each mind the ideal of a people's homage to the God of the people. Wives, children, friends and neighbors, he gathers all into one common fold, making all feel that they are of one blood, and going onward to one common fate, and seeing that they fall not out by the way. Now, what man in this meeting can say he has ever seen our Rector at his house to pay a parochial visit? Not one. (Cries, I have, I have.) Well, I have been five years in this parish and he has never been at my door; and there are many others who can say the same thing. Not one single parochial visit has he paid them. I have been in trouble, and he never ministered unto me; I have been sick and he never visited me. This is not my own experience merely, but it is the experience of every man of my acquaintance. He never voluntarily paid them a single parochial visit. Now, is this right? Is it right for any man occupying the position of Rector, so to neglect his duties? This matter must come home to every man's feelings. Every man in the parish must feel the want of a Rector who will not only come when he is sent for, but who will come voluntarily. It has never been denied that these are the duties of a Rector. Everybody admits that they are. There are many families in this parish belonging by education and habit to our Church who now attend the ministrations of other denominations; some of them have attended our Church and have left because they say that while so attending they never had the benefit of a visit from, or the advice or pastoral care of the Rector; others knowing the deficiencies of care here have never allied themselves in this country with our Church, although belonging to her before coming to Canada. I have before me a speech of a well-known man, whom one may safely term a prophet of your own—not a high churchman—but a man who holds the position of principal of one of those colleges for the manufacture of "Illiterati," where, by a score or two of so-called Divinity lectures, they convert bumpkins into clergymen, which have such a sweet savour in mis-called evangelical nostrils on both sides of the Atlantic—the Rev. Dr. Baylee, principal of St. Aidans, Birkenhead, in a lecture delivered on the 20th of last February, at Preston, states—

"Scripture says that some are apostles, some prophets and some pastors



and teachers. The apostle does not say some pastors and some teachers, but some pastors *and* teachers; for he means that the pastor should be the teacher and the teacher the pastor, because we, the clergy, should go from house to house finding out whether men are going right or wrong, and doing what we can to put those right that are going wrong, and to keep those right that are right."

Is that the case here? By none that I am ever aware of. I am in a position to know how the parochial duties of the Rector are neglected. I have attended the sick of the poor of this parish, and they have never seen the Rector or ever heard of him, and I know members of the church who do not know that there ever was a Rector. There is a gentleman in this room, a member of the church who has lived here for years, and who did not know until a few days ago, who was Rector, or whether there was any Rector. Now that could not be, if the parochial duties of visitation from house to house were performed as they ought to be. I say the Rector of this parish never acted as Rector, he has never risen above the position of Rector of a clique within the congregation.

Then with regard to other duties, I take the school that meets Sunday after Sunday in this room. Until within the last three months, the church catechism has never been taught there. Individual teachers may teach it; but as a part of English church teaching it has not been taught.

*Bishop* :—I beg to correct the doctor. The school is well conducted by individual teachers, and if individual teachers teach the catechism, then the school teaches it.

*Dr. Landor* :—I say again, in spite of that contradiction; that theca techism has not been taught in this school until within the last three months. I heard a gentleman say that he examined his children and found they did not know it, and he remonstrated. [I will add in this place a complete corroboration of my statement that the church catechism is not taught in this Church of England school] I addressed a note to the undermentioned gentleman, and the following is his reply.

LONDON, April 3rd, 1866.

DEAR SIR :—In reply to your note of this morning, relative to the teaching of the Church Catechism in St. Paul's Sunday-school, I may state that it has formed no part of the regular course of instruction during the past ten years,

except for two or three Sabbaths about 4 or 5 years ago, and also during the last three months.

In testifying to the above facts, as a teacher, I feel bound to state that the aim of the teachers has been to give the children a sound Scriptural knowledge of the leading truths of Christianity as contained in the Bible, which, I consider, embraces the essence of the Catechism, and materially more.

I am, yours truly,

HENRY BRIANT.

[ If the Rector had ever taught in, or superintended the school, he must have known this, and he would not have dared to hazard so flat a contradiction to so patent a truth as my statement. As to the teaching being thoroughly Scriptural, it must be clear that it is only so, as far as the teachers interpret Scripture, and not as the Church interprets it, or else why omit the Church's teaching.]

*Dr. Landor* :—Again, there are no children who come into other churches, so ill behaved, so ill taught to observe propriety of forms in Church as these are. The children sit behind me, and they read newspapers and story books, and even play with marbles and cents, and talk during the whole service. I have complained of that matter, and for a time it has been rectified, but only for a time ; complaint only produced temporary amelioration.

Again, I alluded last year to the matter of the cemetery. There is no other Rector that for year after year, for so many years, would be content that his parishioners should be buried with only half of the burial service read. I called attention to this matter last year. I moved a resolution about it ; but no action was taken in the matter. No attempt has been made by the Rector to remedy the evil. Is there another Rector in the wide world who could be content to have things remain as they are ?

*Bishop*.—That statement is very much wide of the fact. The burial service consists of two services—that performed in the church and that confined to the burial ground. If a person is buried with the oneservice his friends pay a certain fee ; if he has the two services they pay an additional fee, and it is not every one that can afford to have both services—only those who are possessed of considerable means.

*Dr. Landor*.—That does not make the slightest difference. The fact remains the same—only half the burial service is read at our

cemetery. I must confess to total ignorance of the assertion that the burial service is two services. It is one in our Prayer Book,—only, one part is in the church and one on the ground; that in the church is never performed here. I never heard in England that there were two services or two charges, one only accessible to the rich. There, rich and poor are alike buried with the same service complete in all its parts. It is for you only to ask for more money when you bury your richer parishioners. As to the remark that if you do more you must be paid more, to say the least it is an undignified position.

*Bishop* :—No such thing was said.

*Dr. Landor* :—I cannot think what your remarks mean then. If parties choose to pay an additional fee, the whole of the service would be read.

*Bishop* :—No man has a right to twist words in that way. I have only stated that every Rector, in every case, would take more for performing the two services than the one.

*Dr. Landor* :—If he would take more, he is to be paid more. What is the object of your statement, if it does not mean what I have said. But it really does not effect the matter at all. I contend that you have made no effort for many years, for six to my knowledge, to amend that which every churchman must feel to be a very great omission.

In your remarks, you laid very great stress upon the fact that the diocese provided you no house, and that the income of the Bishop could not be supposed to be sufficient to meet this want. The income of the Bishop is £600—\$2400 a year. And to that the Rector enjoys £250 commutation money.

*Bishop* :—No, no, you are wrong again, it is only £206.

*Dr. Landor* :—Well, take it at that. That makes about £800 a year as the income of the Bishop—an income that the people cannot touch. Now, I say, that income is greater than that of the majority of colonial Bishops, who have no houses provided for them. The late Bishop Broughton, of Sidney, N. S. W., had an income, the half of which he gave to form another bishopric, when he found the labour beyond his strength; but then he was a high churchman who was content to display his faith by his works. He never was

one who was always vaunting his faith and hiding his works. No house was provided for him, nor were his rooms furnished with carpets at the cost of his people. He was content with painted furniture and carpetless rooms, and though his simplicity of life and self-denial may be rarely imitated, it is often more nearly approached by colonial Bishops than your more selfish retention of a luxurious house.

When Mr. Wilson, for thirty years your parishioner, introduced this matter to a former Vestry Meeting, he made this offer:—"If you will give me the management of the rectorial property, I will take care that the salary of the curate shall be paid and give you a handsome income besides." No answer was made to that offer at the time.

The Bishop here interrupted and said, as also reported in the *Prototype*:—"But Mr. Wilson took care not to accept the offer of the management when made to him afterwards." [I wrote immediately to ask Mr. Wilson if this statement was true.] Here is his reply:—

BROCKVILLE, 5th APRIL, 1866.

DEAR SIR,—The management of the rectory property was never directly or indirectly offered to me by the Bishop, or any one on his behalf, at any time. If it had I should have taken it.

Very truly yours, J. WILSON.

[For the information of those at a distance, it may be necessary to say that Mr. Wilson is the Hon. John Wilson, one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas, Upper Canada. Comment is needless; nothing can be too strong to say.] Now, I state that the income of the Bishop amounts from ecclesiastical sources to upwards of £800 pounds a year. I say that the man who receives that income ought to be ashamed of holding the rectory also. You alluded to the fact that the Bishop of Toronto held the rectory of St. James' also for many years; but you forgot to say, what many old residents have told me, that no one at the time condemned the Bishop of Toronto more strongly than the Rector of London; and no one has held the rectory of London with a more tenacious grip than the Bishop of Huron.

*Bishop*:—I never condemned the Bishop of Toronto at the time. He held the rectory till a good income was provided for him and then he resigned.



*Dr. Landor* :—You have an income of £800 a year, and yet you do not resign.

*Bishop* :—This diocese has pledged itself to provide a house for me to live in. The Bishop of Toronto gets £1,500 a year.

*Dr. Landor* :—If the diocese has been pledged, it ought to fulfill that pledge; but I say that it is no justification of your conduct, that one man does wrong you can do it also. It is not right for a man to hold a living, the duties of which he does not fulfill, and which he hinders another from performing. This is my position. I say, whether the Church Society requested you to hold the rectory or not, whether the diocese pledged themselves to build you a house or not, it is not right for you to hold a position and receive the income due to that position, the duties of which you do not fulfill and never have fulfilled, and hindering any other person from performing these duties—for the duties have not been performed. And what an excuse it is for a Christian Bishop to make! What an unevangelical sense of gospel examples, in the true sense of the word! But how characteristic of the party sense of evangelical duty! Because there is no house, you will hold the rectory, do none of the duties, and see your flock suffer all the consequent injuries of such a determination! This is a question I do not care to reiterate. This is not only my opinion, but also the opinion of every man of my acquaintance, some of whom have lived here seven or eight years, and some even twenty years, and yet have never received a single pastoral visit from you. I cannot too often repeat that; it is notorious and felt by all the parish. I have shown that the income of the bishoprick is amply sufficient to maintain any man—an income larger than the great majority of colonial Bishops have, who have no house provided for them. I will now show that the income of the Rector is amply sufficient to maintain a Rector, and if necessary provide for the curate also. I will not overstate this matter. The income of the Rector, from rents, is \$1,100—strictly, I believe \$1,180. The house cannot be reckoned as worth less than £100 a year; plenty of people would give £100 for that house—\$400 more; that is \$1,500; the cemetery fees and the surplice fees amount to somewhere about \$400 more—say \$300 if you like; I am not particular to a hundred dollars. That will raise the income of the Rector to \$1,800 a year, and year by year it will largely increase, and yet because no house, worth at most \$400, is

found, you retain \$1,800. There are scores of clergymen throughout the community who would be delighted to take that rectory. And we might add, in addition to that the income of the curate, which is derived from the congregation. It is a mistake to suppose that the pew rents belong to the Rector, as I have heard him claim them. They did belong to the Rector up to the time an act was obtained to mortgage the Church; since then they are pledged to the Trust and Loan Society and cannot be appropriated by the Rector until the debt is paid off.

*Bishop* :—Quite right.

*Dr. Landor* :—The Rector has no more control over the pew rents than I have. Now, I say the income of the Rector is sufficient to attract a man to perform the duties of that office. And if the person who took it, could do all the work of the parish, though there is ample work for both Rector and Curate, but if one man were to do the work of both, the salary of the curate might be saved, and applied towards the extinguishment of the debt. Therefore, I think I have shown you clearly that the income of the Bishop is enough for the Bishop, and the income of the Rector enough for the Rector. I think I am perfectly justified in calling upon this meeting of the congregation to express their opinion that the Rector ought to resign the rectory, and give place to some one who will perform the duties of that office. I have felt myself most strongly, the want of some person in the position of Rector who could visit me. And I say it is the duty of every person in this congregation, who wishes to have pastoral visitation, to support this motion. If you do not support this motion, the responsibility of the position of these things must rest upon you. No man can long resist public opinion. If it is your wish that these things shall not continue, they cannot long remain unchanged. It is no matter that the Rector says he will not resign the rectory, until a house is provided for him. I have put my hand to the plough, and I will not go back until I have turned this dirty ecclesiastical furrow under. I will continue to agitate this question year after year, both by speech and writing, and will use every means in my power to have the evil remedied. If we cannot obtain this measure from the Rector from a sense of right, we will extort it from him from a sense of shame. I have not at all put this matter too strongly. I have only made remarks (turning to the Rector) upon you as regards

your performance of the duties of the parish. I make no personal remarks upon you at all; you may be the most upright man in the community for ought I care. But I do most strongly deprecate the way in which your duties as Rector are performed. And therefore I again appeal to the congregation here and say to them that if they do not support this motion the responsibility of this evil state must fall upon them. I now beg leave to move my resolutions:—"That in the opinion of this meeting, the welfare of the community requires the resignation of the Rector, and the appointment of a successor who will have time and inclination to fulfil the duties of his office."

*Dr. Harper*, on rising to second the motion, said he could testify to the truth of the statements made by *Dr. Landor*, with respect to pastoral visitation. He had observed when he came to this country many years ago, that the duties of pastoral visitation were not performed by the Rector, whom he took to task for such negligence, at the same time remarking it was so totally different to the conduct of his beloved minister at home, who had won golden opinions from all denominations of christians, was highly esteemed and loved by that sect of christians "The Society of Friends," who do not favorably regard a church establishment, nay, even Roman Catholics looked upon him with complacency, by reason of the true christian character exhibited by him in his works of faith and labors of love amongst the poor of his parish. Such a shepherd over his flock, was one for imitation. *Dr. Harper* drew the attention (of the vestry by way of contrast) to a gentleman of the city, high in station, who is constantly going about doing good to the bodies and souls of the people in religious visitations amongst the poor without pay, or reward, except that which cometh from above. He (*Dr. Harper*,) likewise drew the attention of the Bishop and vestry to the case of a recently deceased clergyman, a *Rev. Mr. Philpott*, a son of the venerable and aged Lord Bishop of Exeter, who had died universally regretted and deeply lamented by his parishioners, particularly the poor of his charge. The press remarked at the loss of such a faithful Pastor, how often had he been seen on his favorite pony, with basket under arm on his errands of mercy for the procuring of the necessary comforts for the *sick poor* of his parish, such actions were well worthy of imitation, giving full proof that true, genuine and evangelical principles ruled in the heart of one who thus so fully squared his life with the maxims and precepts of the Bible, the only true and



infallible guide of conduct. He (Dr Harper,) further observed, he liked to see ministers have faith in their mission, but much better he liked to witness the manifestation of that faith by works, and most assuredly it was the work of a christian minister to visit the families of his congregation, to look after the widow and the fatherless, to care for the poor as well as the rich, this the Rector had not done. He had great pleasure in seconding the motion of Dr. Landor, for the separation of the duties of Rector from that of the Bishop.

[The speech of Dr. Harper, is given as corrected by himself.—H.L.]

*Bishop* :—Since the double charge of the bishopric and the rectory have devolved upon me, I have not performed the duties which the Doctor speaks of to the same extent which I performed them before. The reason of that is that it was simply impossible for me to do so. But I have provided one, with whom I have constantly taken counsel, to perform the pastoral duties of the Rector, and with what zeal and energy he has done it you all known (Cheers.) It is well know that the Rectors of many large parishes in the old country give themselves up to literary or other pursuits, and employ curates in their places.

*Dr. Landor*.—Not in many parishes.

*Bishop* :—I merely mention it to be the case in some parishes, not in all, most assuredly not in all. The person Dr. Harper mentions is a most admirable exception to this. But in very many parishes especially in the rural districts, the Rector takes no care whatsoever of the parochial duties of the parish. They employ a curate or perhaps two curates, and the whole work devolves upon them. Since I have been bishop, it is true I have not done a large amount of parochial work. But Dr. Landor is certainly wrong when he says I have made no pastoral visits among the congregation. I have paid many pastoral visits since I became bishop ; but most assuredly not so many as I would wish to. Still the duty has been amply provided for ; and because one man does not do it can it therefore be said it is not done at all ! I say that the duty has been well done, and that pastoral visits have been paid regularly. Dr. Landor wishes to have two or three clergymen call to see him. He has had one ; “Dr. Landor not one,” has he improved by that one ? He speaks of the ill-behavior of the school children in church, and yet he himself leaves the church. He insults the congregation by leaving the church at the



close of the prayer, (hear, hear.) He insults me every day by withdrawing from the church. He is too wise in theology to be instructed. Dr. Landor must remember he puts himself out of the pale of propriety. When a man outrages every feeling of propriety and every feeling of decency he cannot expect a clergyman to be on social terms with him. When he sits during the reading of the Athanasian Creed to show he does not believe it, and withdraws before the sermon, how can he expect a clergyman to seek him as a friend and associate. Let Dr. Landor go home and do his duty, and then he will be in a position to talk to other people of their duty. As I said in the beginning I desire to be placed in a different position. Dr. Landor has gone into calculations, all of which are wrong except the one item of six hundred a year. The amount of the commutation is £206 and not £250 as Dr. Landor stated.

*Dr. Landor* :—I corrected that, and accepted your own statement, namely, £206.

*Bishop* :—If such a change were made as would warrant me in placing another Rector over the church, I would gladly do it, and the sooner it is done the better.

*Dr. Landor* :—The remarks of the Bishop come with singular ill grace from a man who deprecated personal attacks in the outset of this meeting. I addressed no remarks upon your personal character, and yet you attack my religious character. You state I am in the habit of leaving the church; I am. But you state partly the truth, and lead the people to believe it is all truth. For the last two years I have left the church, and you well know the reason. I had correspondence with you, concerning the doctrines taught in that church.—I have heard it taught in that church, that adultery and murder committed by David, a converted man, were not punishable by God, as if the same crimes were committed by a sinner; I have heard it taught in that church, that Christ did not die for all mankind, but only for the elect,—contrary to the Church catechism and contrary to the whole of Scripture. When I heard these doctrines taught in that church, I called your notice to them in a letter to you. (A copy of which and the reply of the Bishop, is appended to this report, where the matter of this accusation is more fully gone into.)

When I see a clergyman stand up in the church, with the Bible in his extended hand, and say that if this doctrine is not true, then is

“Christ a liar,” (there the man sits now,) how can I stop in the church and hear such an expression as that used? I never will. But these matters make no real difference with the question at issue. The real question is that the duties of the Rector have not been performed. It is no excuse whatever for you to say that another man does your duties. If another man does your duties, then let him have your office. You bring up the examples of Rectors in England to justify your position. Now, I have lived in England perhaps as long as you have; I have lived in three parishes, and never found such a state of things as exists in this parish. Again, in your last intemperate remarks, you addressed me as if I were an atheist or an infidel. I am as thorough a believer in the gospel as you are. I dare say you will endeavor to make capital of the fact that I presided at Mr. Mahon’s lecture. Perhaps you forgot it. Now, I desire to say I am no more a believer in Mr. Mahon’s lecture than you are. Religious belief is not a matter of logic, but of internal conviction. I have no sympathy with the opinions of Mr. Mahon respecting miracles; but I am happy to say that I am a friend of Mr. Mahon; and I undertake to say, that if it were a question as to whose word would meet with the most credit in the estimation of the people, yours or his, I undertake to say that Mr. Mahon’s would. Mr. Mahon would be more respected as a man of his word. Personalities began with the Rector. I abstained from them entirely in my opening speech. He said, without the possibility of knowing it to be true, that I did not believe in the Athanasian Creed. I do believe in that creed. Although the Bishop unjustly denounces me for not believing the Athanasian Creed, he had an able and wise church-warden two years ago, who had occupied that position for some years, to the great advantage of the pecuniary interests of this Church, who did not believe that creed, and who always made a point of shutting his book when it was read, and this fact of his unbelief was known all those years to the Curate, and ought to have been known, probably was, to the Rector, yet no denunciation of him ever came out of the Rector’s mouth. He was eligible for ecclesiastical friendships, because he was of use. His unbelief on that point went for nothing, his utility for everything, and so it always is with Evangelicals. Principle last, selfishness first, doctrines if false may be held by the elect without prejudice to their salvation. I wonder how a man with these facts known could dare to charge me with unbelief in the Athanasian Creed. I sat down last Sunday for

personal considerations only, but never before or at any other time. Again you say that you could never be friends with me. For the first few years I resided here there was nothing of the nature you now attempt to prove against me, I had done nothing to prevent your paying me pastoral visit, yet you have never been near me. And there are plenty other members of the congregation who can say the same thing. I say that "the diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought out that which was lost, as I live saith the Lord I will require my flock at your hand." A denunciation addressed to the Sheppards of Israel, but more amply merited by you.

*Benj. Shaw, Esq.* :—I am satisfied that Dr. Landor as well as this meeting will be satisfied to put the resolution in a shape less offensive to your lordship, that is, if the same object be obtained. I think the congregation would like to look on our bishop with respect. For my own part, had I no respect for the Bishop, I certainly never would enter St. Paul's Cathedral. I have been taught from infancy to look on clergy with reverence. With your permission I will propose a resolution which I think will have all the effects that Dr. Landor wishes to obtain. "That in the opinion of the vestry the spiritual and pecuniary interests of the congregation of St. Paul's would be benefited by the separation of the duties of Rector from those of the Bishop of the diocese."

*Dr. Landor* agreed to substitute this for his own.

*Mr. Dyas* could not see how the pecuniary interests of the congregation could be benefited by the separation. He certainly thought it would be a pecuniary loss. He begged to ask the mover of the resolution to explain that point.

*Mr. Shaw* said he thought that point was fully explained by Dr. Landor.

The Bishop in putting the motion said :—The Doctor has gone into figures with reference to the income. My son, who transacts all my business, I believe is provided with a statement of the income from the first day of my consecration until now. I will now ask him to read that statement.

*Mr. Cronyn*, then read the following statement:—He said as regards this year, *the statements of Dr. Landor would be correct*; (hear, hear, from Dr. Landor), but with regard to the past the income has never reached the amount he named. The average income for the last eight years has been \$648.62. The income for the several years deducting the amount paid for taxes was as follows: for 1858, \$352.00; for 1859, \$352.00; for 1860, \$671.58; for 1861, \$836.27. A large amount for arrears of taxes was paid in that year; for 1862, it was \$883.79; for 1863, \$634.89; for 1864, 996.56; and for 1865, \$761.87. The income for the year 1866, will be about \$1,100 or \$1,200. In the vestry of 1862, the Bishop in reply to Mr Wilson, said that *all* the income was swallowed by taxes, yet, here it is shown that there has been an income since 1858.

The resolution was then put to the meeting and carried.—Ayes 21, Nays, 16.

*The Bishop*:—I entirely agree with that resolution. I desire that the rectory be separated from the Bishopric, and so soon as the diocese fulfil the pledge given to me and to the Governor-General, I will carry out that resolution, but not till then.

*Dr. Landor*:—Then I must move a resolution, stating that in the opinion of this meeting the resolution ought to be carried out in the course of a year.

*The Bishop*:—That cannot be done for the simple reason that this meeting has nothing whatsoever to do with the patronage of the rectory.

*Dr. Landor*:—I do not wish the meeting to interfere with the parsonage; but I wish to call on this meeting to express the opinion that the resolution ought to be carried out in the course of a year.

*Bishop*:—I cannot consent to that at all.

*Dr. Landor*:—You say the meeting cannot carry this resolution into effect I know very well they cannot without your consent. They can only express the opinion that it is not right for things to continue as they are. And in spite of this resolution you will not consent to have these things changed until the diocese builds you a house. And so things will continue to go on as they are for the next ten years. I say this is a miserable and shameful position for a bishop to occupy.



*The Bishop* :—Whenever the diocese, and London as a part of the diocese, does its duty towards the episcopacy I am most ready and willing and anxious to separate the rectory from the bishopric and appoint a Rector. But until that is done it would be sacrificing the interests of the diocese to consent to the resolution. I shall carry out the resolution as soon as I can, perhaps in a year but I hope in not more than two years.

*Dr. Landor* :—I have now to ask your lordship a question as bishop, quite independent of the resolution. In the 18th clause of the church temporalities act, for Canada, it is said, "In the event of any person or persons or bodies corporate, desiring to erect a church or churches, etc., the patronage shall be vested in them in the same manner as in England: they first having obtained the Bishops license to erect such a church." Now I should say that within the last week, upwards of £1,000 have been promised for the purpose of building a church under this clause, if your permission is granted, and if the right of presentation be given to the parties who undertake to accept the nomination of the Archbishop of Canterbury. We want to know if we shall have the right under this act to build a church, upon condition that the right of presentation of such church be given by the trustees to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Shall we have your permission as we are obliged under this act to obtain it.

*The Bishop* :—With regard to the right of presentation, I do not conceive it is in my power to give it to the Archbishop of Canterbury. I should be very glad to see persons coming forward to build, sufficiently endowed churches; but before I give my consent as required under that act I should know the parties who are to be the trustees of that building. I should know who they were; *I should be satisfied with their views and opinions*, and everything concerning them I should have a right to enquire into. If Dr. Landor will furnish me with the names of those parties who are to be the trustees of the church, then I shall give him an answer to his question. But I cannot consent that persons unknown to me, persons that I was not fully satisfied about, should have the patronage of any church in my diocese.

*Dr. Landor* :—Allow me to ask you do you mean by that, you will allow the appointment of no clergymen, except those who hold the same doctrines as yourself? Do you mean that you will permit no one to be a clergyman here, who does not hold such opinions and tenets as are held by the majority of this diocese, and by yourself?

*The Bishop* :—MOST ASSUREDLY I DO MEAN THAT.

*Dr. Lander* :—That means you will have no opinions but your own in the diocese.

*Bishop* :—I think you will allow no one to think except as you do.

*Dr. Lander* :—On the contrary, I do not care how many Evangelicals there are in the church or who professes or acts on their views, but I object to a Bishop who rules the Church of England under his care which allows a great latitude of opinion, like a sect which admits of no opinions but its own narrow and prejudiced views. I do not want others to embrace my opinions on religious matters, I want freedom to enjoy my own, such is enjoyed in England and in other dioceses here, which is impossible under your rule, for you have now declared that you will not permit a church to be built and endowed unless the clergyman preaches your doctrines.

*Bishop* :—This vestry is now adjourned to this day fortnight and here I would recommend that if any one desires to bring a matter under notice they wait until the hour is announced by the proper authority, or it may be attended with great inconvenience, I had on last Thursday arranged with the church-wardens to have this meeting held on this day at half-past ten in the forenoon, but when Dr. Lander's notice for seven in the evening came out, it was altered.

*Dr. Lander* :—That is the strangest statement made this evening, for you say you had arranged with the church-warden last Thursday. Now I went to Mr. Hunt, church-warden, on Saturday, at one o'clock, to say that I had heard that some measure was to be attempted to defeat my motion, by altering the time from that at which it had been held for at least five years. Mr. Hunt said he did not know that to be so. I also saw Mr. Elliott, church-warden, on Saturday morning and mentioned my apprehensions to him also. He said nothing, but I am sure that he would not have allowed me to leave him under a false impression. Therefore, when you say that you arranged it on Thursday, I cannot conceive it to be possible. The Bishop turned to Mr. Hunt, who said that he was not aware on Saturday the meeting was to be at half-past ten in the morning. Mr. Elliott said nothing, but I am sure if he could have confirmed the Bishop's gross mistake or gross mis-statement, he would have done so. My letter to Mr. MacMullen, for the list of the pew-holders was sent on Wednesday, March 28th. Before that day there was no

intention, expressed or imagined, of altering the hour of the Vestry Meeting. I leave the public to come to their own conclusions on this the final scene of an evening, exhibiting many traits characteristic of the man.

There were not less than 200 persons in the Vestry, and yet the Bishop-Rector could only obtain sixteen votes, and some of these were his nearest relations and connections. Is it conceivable that out of so large a number of parishioners so few would have voted for him, if they could conscientiously have done so, for it must be remembered that he is a man of position, of much influence, with many families connected with him, residing in this city; and I am an unpopular man, offending many by outspoken habits; of no influence whatever, and no weight in the community; and yet he had only sixteen votes. It is true, I had only twenty-one, but then there were two hundred people there who would have been glad to have voted for him, if their opinions had not been against him. I think this fact tells more of the justice and truth of my motion and statements than if there had been a large division carried by a small majority. It is also a most effective condemnation of the Bishop, that considering there were men (who had resided in the parish for all periods up to thirty years) at the meeting, not one spoke a single word in his favor. Is it to be conceived that old residents and new would have all remained silent if they had felt they could have supported his statements? The facts are quite the reverse. Old residents present there told me that they could bear witness that many of the statements made by the Bishop were erroneous, but they did not wish to speak against him, though they would say nothing for him. No work requiring money or help can obtain either, from old residents here, because they have no confidence in the Rector, and will do nothing while he continues Rector. Every one who has tried to canvass the parish for any work knows this fact. I said nothing about the violation of promises (made before his election) to resign the Rectory, nor about the amendment moved by Dr. Cronyn in the Synod of Toronto, to the effect that the elected Bishop should resign on consecration, because these facts add nothing to the force of my arguments, which were founded on the miserable state of the parish in his charge.

I have a few comments to make on the Rector's opening speech, which I omitted to notice in mine. He lays the greatest stress on an alleged pledge of the diocese to build him a house, before the Governor-General would give his consent to divide the diocese of



Toronto. What diocese gave that pledge? That of Toronto? It could not be that of Huron, which was not formed. But if the delegates, or committee, or individuals who waited on the Governor, gave it, by whose authority did they do it? I cannot obtain any reply to these questions, even from those who well knew the whole circumstances at the time. They say that there was no pledge further than this, that when the money could be raised, a house should be built; that Mr. Cronyn himself was the pledger; that it was a conditional promise, not a pledge, for there was no existing authority entitled to make the pledge, unless the diocese of Toronto chooses to consider that the pledge came from it. The Bishop states that a great duty devolves upon London, for he says, "Let London do its duty." How is this? Did London also pledge itself to any special obligation in the matter of the house? No one can make any meaning of this statement, and all deny that London has any duty in this house matter, beyond its duty as a part of the diocese. He quoted the case of the Bishop of Quebec, retaining his rectory with his bishopric, but a gentleman present at the meeting, tells me that he resided long in Quebec, and that the Bishop-Rector there did his duty as Rector, and visited his parishioners, and that he paid rent for his house. Bishop McClosky, of Michigan, also did the work of Rector without an assistant; doing the usual Sunday duty of a parish clergyman. The Bishop of Michigan replied to a lady who asked him if he did all the work in his own church, "Yes I do; clergymen are too scarce in my diocese to permit me to be idle on a Sunday."

The Bishop of Michigan was Rector of Detroit at the time of his election to the bishopric. There was no episcopal endowment fund provided for the Bishop. He, therefore, did the duties of Bishop on his rectorial income, the diocese only paying his current expenses, until they raised a fund to endow the bishopric and build him a residence. This case is therefore altogether against the Bishop of Huron. It rather contrasts most strongly with his conduct. I imagine that there is also much to be said about his statements concerning the Bishop of Toronto which would give a very different color to that part of his speech.

These cases therefore cited by him, tell against him. Nor if the facts were as he stated, could they justify him, unless he wishes men to infer, that the neglect of duty by others,



justifies its neglect by himself, nor does the conclusions he draws from their statements and other analagous instances in England, which he recites, stand on a sounder basis than his facts. His conclusion is, that in new countries this double holding of offices is necessary, from the circumstances of such countries.—On the contrary, it is far less necessary and less justifiable than in the old countries; for in new countries, there is more need of efficient performance of duties, and of good examples, as it is well known there is in them a greater tendency to throw off moral restraint, and in men to divest themselves of religious principles, for there is not the constraining example and influence of a higher and better educated class, which has so large a share in keeping the mass in order and propriety of life, in England. No. In new countries it is most important that the best and most disinterested examples should be set, especially by the clergy of our church, who take the place in education and standing of the upper classes in the old country, or at least ought to do so. Such examples of office-grasping as this I am condemning, do more injury to the cause of morality and religion than open vice, and its defence by the Bishop is as indecent as the act itself. He alludes to his great efforts to raise the bishopric endowment, but the story of that fund, is the most indecent of all the things connected with him or the diocese. I addressed the following letter to Mr. E. Adams, who is intimately acquainted with the whole transaction, and his answer is appended. It will be new to those strangers whom the Bishop addresses, and wishes to become acquainted with the affairs of the diocese and Rectory.

LONDON, 4th April, 1866.

MY DEAR SIR :

I believe you are well acquainted with the manner in which the Fund for the establishment of the Bishopric was obtained in this Diocese. I have been told that it was got up by parties, Clergymen, who urged that if it was inconvenient to pay cash, notes might given, upon the condition that the interest should be paid semi-annually for ten years, and then the principal. You will have seen the report of the Bishop's remarks in the late Vestry, where he says that he was the person who spent much time and travel in obtaining the money for the Fund mentioned.

I should like to hear from you whatever you please to say on this matter.

I remain, yours truly,

HENRY LANDOR.

EDWARD ADAMS, ESQ.

LONDON, C. W., 4th April, 1866.

MY DEAR SIR :

I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this date. The information you have received of the manner in which the Fund to establish the Bishopric of this Diocese was obtained, I can certify to as correct. The late Dr. Evans, of Simcoe, and Dr. Boomer, of Galt, called upon me at my office, soliciting a subscription to form the Episcopal Fund, and stated that if it was inconvenient for me to pay the money, my note would be taken, on which I would only be required to pay the interest semi-annually, and the principal in ten years from that date.

On another occasion, Dr. Boomer urged the matter, when I again declined giving any subscription, stating that my experience in church affairs here, led me to consider it unsafe to trust either my note or funds to the management of the Rector of St. Paul's, and those associated with him. I remarked to Dr. Boomer and the late Mr. Shade, of Galt, who were then present, that I did not expect Dr. Cronyn would give up the Rectory or the House, even if he was elected Bishop. They said he would have to do so, but as they intended seeing him that evening they would ask him. On their return, they assured me Dr. Cronyn had promised them that if elected Bishop, he would immediately give up the Rectory and house.

[For the information of those at a distance, I insert a copy of the Resolution of the [Synod, of Toronto, before the Diocese of Huron was separated from Toronto]:

"Any Clergyman elected a Bishop, and holding at the time of such election any preferment or benefice, shall resign such preferment or benefice prior to his consecration."

Mr. Adams continues :

To satisfy you that I was right in the opinion I had formed of Dr. Cronyn's management of church property, I need only refer you to the sermon preached by Dr. Verschoyle, on the occasion of his consecration as Bishop of Huron, in which he referred to the great value of the Rectory he was giving up, to accept so much smaller an income as Bishop, and to the statement of Mr. Cronyn of the present value of the Rectory, made at the late Vestry Meeting, for it is well known that the Rector is alone responsible for the affairs of the Rectory, as he has strenuously resisted any interference with his management.

The actions brought in the Courts of this Province to enforce payment of notes obtained for the Episcopal Fund, are well known, and furnish evidence of the broken faith with parties who had given notes.

I would add that I never heard of Dr. Cronyn spending "time and travel" to collect funds to establish the Bishopric, but I did of his labor to secure his election.

Yours truly,

EDWARD ADAMS.

HENRY LANDOR, Esq.

The Hon. Jas. Small, Judge of the County of Middlesex, &c., has sent me the following letter :

LONDON, 7th April, 1866.

MY DEAR SIR :

At your request I have no objection to give you the following statement of the circumstances which led to the action against me upon my note for fifty pounds to the Church Society, previous to the appointment of a Bishop to this Diocese. Two Clergymen called upon me and stated that the Governor-General would not recommend the appointment of one until he was satisfied there was a sufficient Fund secured, the interest of which should be solely applicable to the payment of his salary, that they were soliciting subscriptions, and wished to know what they should put my name down for, that I should not be called upon for more than the interest of the sum I might name. I told them, under these circumstances, they might put me down for £50, as all I could then afford, but thereafter I might give more. One of them then took out of his pocket a book of printed forms of promissory notes, and filled one up for me to sign, which I objected to, stating that I would not make myself liable to pay at once that amount, as it would be very inconvenient. They then assured me, *that it should never be made use of further than to satisfy the Governor-General of the amount of principal that could be secured, upon which, considering the standing of the gentlemen I was dealing with, I signed the note.* In about twelve months I received a letter from Messrs. H. and H., informing me my note was in their hands and must be paid immediately with interest. At this I felt so disgusted that I determined not to pay a farthing unless compelled by law. The consequence was a suit, in which the jury gave a verdict in my favor, which was set aside by the Queen's Bench, and from failing to prove that the Plaintiffs, H. H., *knew the circumstances under which I gave the note.* Both Rev. gentlemen, *on their oath, in the witness box, failing to remember anything about it, and the book of printed forms, with the memoranda in the margin, having been lost or mislaid.* Rather than have any more annoyance, I paid the amount, in my opinion most unjustly.

In giving this statement I am bound to say, I find no fault with any one in the transactions but the two clergymen and the then churchwardens, who, I am well satisfied knew all the circumstances under which the note was given, and that it was a *breach of good faith* on their part in selling it as they did. I have not referred to dates as it would give me some trouble.

Yours respectfully,

JAS. E. SMALL.

H. LANDOR, Esq.

The italics in this letter are the Judge's own.

There are people who imagine that the acts of the two clergymen and the church-wardens of St. Paul, were unknown to the then

Rector, now the Bishop of Huron, and that he was in no wise implicated in the broken faith exhibited towards the givers of these notes, but these people are not to be found in the parish of London, C.W. There are many other facts about the election of the Bishop and the establishment of this episcopate more extraordinary than any I have touched upon, and the strangers now in the parish can learn all those facts by a little careful inquiry, and become as fully acquainted as the Bishop wishes them to be, with all the antecedents of this marvellous history. I have not space to relate them, but private inquiry will readily reveal them all. I have said sufficient to show that his statements are wanting in veracity in some instances, but there runs through most, if not all, a mode of relation more odious to my mind than absolute want of veracity—that is, telling part of the truth so as to leave an impression on the hearers which the whole truth would dissipate.

I refer the account in the Bishop's speech, of the two Bishops of Quebec and Michigan, to this class of half truths ; also the whole history of the alleged pledge of the diocese *before* the separation from Toronto, to build a house, and other similar statements ; the assertion of the offer of the property to Mr. Wilson ; the teaching of the catechism in the school, and the intention to hold the meeting before my application for the names of the pew-holders, are examples of want of veracity, standing on undeniable evidence.

The Bishop's attack on me for leaving the church before the sermon, compels me to give the following correspondence, which explains my reasons for my conduct, which cannot be distorted into an insult to the congregation. I might with equal correctness say, that the unpunctuality of the congregation in arriving at church, is an insult to myself, as I am always present before the service commences, as my leaving before it closes, is to them. The reasons given in the correspondence make it a matter of indifference to me whether the Rector considers it an insult or not ; if it is, it is not to his person, but to his opinions. Before acting on my determination, I consulted a clergyman in England, who had known me from boyhood, and I sent him a copy of the correspondence. I am glad to say I had his sanction for my act, when he knew that it was not possible to attend another church where correct views prevailed, and that I must be compelled to listen to such teaching, or never



go to church at all. In England I could easily have found a church where no such detestable views were held. Here it is impossible, and is likely always to continue impossible, until greater power overrides the power of this Bishop.

LONDON, July 13th, 1863.

MY LORD,

Your lordship was at church last Sunday evening, and it will be in your recollection, that the preacher said that "adultery and murder when committed by a believer are met by God, with a different punishment, from adultery and murder committed by a sinner, no crime even so detestable as adultery and murder, can deprive a believer of his future salvation, for in his case God will only chasten him temporarily, and that his salvation is assured, whereas the sinner can have no additional punishment, because in no case can he attain heaven, his portion is hell. The believing adulterer and murderer will only have to wait *for a fresh application* of the Blood of Christ." I have here quoted the preacher's expressions carefully noted at the time. Translated into common language, they mean that whatever crimes the elect commit, their salvation cannot be imperilled, or as a preacher expressed it a few Sundays since in the same Church, "Christ died not for all mankind, but for the select few," another preacher in the same church a few months earlier, stated "God never listens to the prayers of the unconverted."

I ask your Lordship whether these doctrines have the approbation of the Bishop of this Diocese and the Rector of this parish, I think I have a right to ask this question for my own future guidance. I do not intend to give any publicity to this letter or to your answer. (April 4th, 1866. I think myself absolved from this promise by the gross attack made upon my belief and conduct by the Bishop at the Vestry on the 2nd ult.) Therefore I will at once state what my future course will be if your Lordship expresses your approval of these doctrines so often uttered in the pulpit of St. Paul's. I shall continue to attend the prayers of the Church, because, thank God, no clergyman dare tamper with them, but I shall never remain to hear another sermon, and I shall never contribute another cent to any Church or Missionary purpose so long as I remain in this Diocese. I trust your Lordship will give me an explicit answer and I add that I shall consider no answer as equivalent to your Lordship's approval of these opinions.

I remain your Lordship's,

Obed't Servant,

HENRY LANDOR.

To the LORD BISHOP OF HURON.

## [THE BISHOP'S ANSWER]

LONDON, C.W., July 15th, 1863.

MY DEAR DOCTOR,

With reference to your note, you object to the doctrine preached last Sunday evening, in St. Paul's, but I think you have not viewed the statement made on that occasion with perfect fairness. Commenting on the sin and pardon of David, the preacher said that sin in a believer was as odious to God, as sin in an unbeliever, but that God on the renewed repentance of the believer, and on his humble application to the blood of Christ, freely pardoned the transgression of his servant, whatever these transgressions were, (does he not do the same with the sinner, "when the *wicked* man turns from it," &c.,) while at the same time he vindicated the authority of his own law by punishing the transgressor, this life in the sight of men. Now does not this view exactly correspond with what we read in the 12th of 2nd Samuel. David sinned deeply and continued impenitent for several months, we cannot exactly say how long, he makes no movement towards God whom he had so grievously offended during that time; but God who is so rich in mercy, sent Nathan to him and produced deep repentance in David, so that he confessed his sin as we see in the 51st Psalm, the expression of his deep contrition of heart. Immediately Nathan pronounced the words of peace and pardon, but added that as David had given the enemies of the Lord occasion to blaspheme, he should be punished in the sight of men. We believe that the declaration of mercy made by Nathan was fulfilled, and that the Lord put away his sin so far as the eternal consequences of it were concerned.

When the believer in the Lord Jesus Christ sins, and returns penitent and believing to the God he has offended he has God's promise that his sins and iniquities shall be remembered no more. If the unbeliever does the same he will at once obtain the same blessing, but if he is impenitent his portion is with the Devil and his Angels.

This is the Doctrine which I know Mr.——holds and desires to teach, and to this I give my most cordial and entire approval. I shall indeed regret that you should withdraw from the teaching in St. Paul's, but I cannot but uphold what I believe to be the truth of God, in strict conformity with the doctrines of the Church as set forth in her articles.

You also mention an expression which you say was used by another preacher "that Christ only died for the select few." I cannot explain what I did not hear, but I should imagine that he would have explained the expression by referring to the word of our Lord. "I lay down my life for my sheep" and while showing that the sacrifice of Christ was full perfect and sufficient for the sins of the whole world, it was efficient to salvation only in those who are the sheep of Christ. If this was his view I entirely agree with him.

You object also to the expression used by another preacher "that God

never listens to the prayer of the unconverted." If the Preacher intended to say that no man while he continued impenitent could pray with acceptance he only expressed what our Lord so clearly stated. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me. So St. James, "let him ask faith nothing wavering," &c., St. James, i ; 6, 7. So in Proverbs, "the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination," &c. So David, in the 66th Psalm. I should conclude that the object of the preacher was to warn the congregation that nothing was to be regarded as prayer acceptable to God but the prayers of faith, for whatever is not of faith is sin.

I feel assured that you would not willingly deal unjustly with any man. Is there not a danger of this if we take isolated passages from a discourse, and form our opinion on these without reference to the context or general tone of the preacher? I would venture to counsel you to consider the points involved in the above quotation, in a spirit of prayer. I know that the truths of the gospel are not to be apprehended by the natural intellect however cultivated it may be, but we must become as little children, before we can fully apprehend the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

Believe me ever,

Yours faithfully,

BENJAMIN HURON.

I shall not imperil that wisdom in theology which the Bishop attributes to me by commenting on the theology of this reply, in that respect it may form a very fitting subject of discussion to his clerical brethren, especially it may give Provost Whittaker an opportunity of retorting the critical examination of religious teachings which the Bishop once displayed towards him. I avoided that discussion and sent the following reply :

JULY 22nd, 1863.

MY LORD,

I am obliged to your lordship for your answer to my letter, and I thank you for its kind and courteous spirit. I must say that I think it leaves my letter altogether untouched, for you comment on what you believe the preachers meant or intended to say, not on the words they used. I have nothing to do with or remark upon their meaning, because as it was unspoken it cannot be known to me, I have only to judge of the plain obvious meaning of the terms they employed, which seem to me both dangerous and erroneous and that they did use those terms, is not an assumption of mine or a misapprehension, as your lordship suggests, but a fact which I have taken care to have verified by other members of the congregation. You do not seem to me clearly to apprehend that it is to the naked offensiveness of the phrases used that I object myself, and which I consider contrary to the truth of christi-



anity. I have nothing to say to any gloss that may be put upon them by others, or any after explanation that may be given, because such glosses or explanations cannot do away with the evil effects of the injudicious expressions used dogmatically, as they are used in sermons. We hear the phrases, but we don't hear the explanations, and we can judge only of the former, as they appear at the time of delivery, with such explanations as are then given. I did not ask your lordship what explanations you could put upon such phrases yourself, but whether you could approve of them in the plain sense in which you heard them uttered, I can therefore only consider your comment on that episode on David's history as irrelevant, whatever may be its intrinsic merit, moreover, I believe that those phrases mean more, much more in the minds of the utterers, than they do as suggested by your lordship. I think it quite useless to say more. I will only add that I would give a great deal if I could put as harmless a construction upon them as you do, and that I am very far from being actuated by evil wishes or an evil spirit in speaking or thinking as I do about such subjects. I give full credit to others for the sincerity of their belief and the purity of their motives about these views which are so abhorrent to me, and I expect that the same credit for sincerity and purity will be awarded to me.

Thanking your lordship, I finally close the subject and remain,

Yours very sincerely,

The LORD BISHOP OF HURON.

HENRY LANDOR.

I leave comment to others, I trust this correspondence will be sufficient to justify my conduct and free me from the accusation of irreligion. hurled at me by the Bishop. I have not I am sure heard a dozen sermons in this city since the date of these letters, and at one of those times I had the misfortune to hear the Rev'd A. Brookman, agent to the Upper Canada Bible Society, utter the same doctrines and confirm his opinions by the odious expression I have named in my reply to the Bishop's attack.

I must now draw attention to the most lamentable condition of all those christians in this Diocese, who are shocked at the teaching, I have shown to be the only teaching acceptable to them. The Bishop's final reply to my question, (which is printed in the very words of the short-hand reporter I took to the meeting,) tells us most plainly that he will allow only his views to be taught in his Diocese. Genevan principles maintained with Popish intolerance govern the Church community here, and there is no escape from them. The very men who raised such an outcry about the few Evangelical men in the Diocese of Montreal, declare their intention of having no differing opinions from theirs



where they are rulers, not a few who differ from us, say they but none. It is a warning to the few old incumbents in this Diocese who do not hold their views that no promotion or honours will ever fall to their lot. It is also a clear intimation to these who have been appointed under the present regime, that no backsliding unto wider and more christian principles than those held in Episcopal haunts will be tolerated. Let them take heed. It is also an example in this century of living men who like the Puritans and Quakers of New England, have learnt none of the maxims of toleration they had so glibly at the ends of their tongues, when they felt themselves persecuted. They would fly from the fires of Rome with exclamations of horror and quench opposition to themselves in those that burned Servetus. Intolerant themselves with an intolerance unequalled in history, they cry out at the shadow of opposition and level the deadliest darts at their opponents. They have appropriated to themselves a designation which has become a reproach, for the term Evangelical, in its party sense, has universally a meaning diametrically opposed to its gospel sense. Unfortunately we can only escape from their rule by the help of sympathizers and active friends elsewhere. It is certain that we can never expect the privilege the inhabitants of other Dioceses enjoy both in Canada and England. There the latitude allowed by the Church is practised by their rulers. If High Church or Low Church require a building for their use they are at liberty to have it. Where the Bishop is a high Churchman, the Evangelical is ready to force him to induct one of their views when the patron has appointed one, as in the Gorham case; and the Evangelical is equally ready to resist induction here, should the patron appoint one opposed to his views. We appeal then to the Metropolitan and the Bishops of the other Canadian Dioceses to exert themselves to obtain an alteration of that portion of the clause in the Church temporalities act, which requires the Bishop's license, or at least to specify that here, as in England, the Bishops shall not have power to refuse the license to build or prevent patronage, or induction, solely because the clergyman holds views allowed by the Church, but opposed to the Bishop's own. If, on obtaining proper legal opinion we find that the Bishop has no power now to refuse induction, except on fitting grounds, not dependent on differences of opinion; then we also appeal to our fellow christians to help us with their purses to fight the battle of toleration in our law Courts

against our intolerant Evangelical Bishop. We are not men of extreme opinions, we are no High Churchmen in the usual if in any sense of that phrase; there are no such men in Canada. We belong to that extensive class of men who are in neither extreme, and are only desirous of worshipping our God where our senses shall not be offended by doctrines and sentiments like those I have described as prevalent in this Diocese. We wish for an opportunity of worshipping according to the principles of the Church of England as exhibited in the majority of Churches in England and Canada. Without assistance from those who have power and influence to procure the amendment of the law our wishes can never be realized. And without the help of sympathising christians, in Canada and in England, our struggle against intolerance must be long and persevering before it can be successful. We are not schismatic. We only desire that liberty and justice which the Church of England affords all her members, but which we sue our Bishop for, in vain. "*Justitia est habitus animi suumcuique tribuens.*" A Ciceronean maxim of equity and toleration altogether unknown to his Lordship of Huron.

This pamphlet would not have been published if the separation of the rectory of London, from the bishopric of Huron, had been its only, or even its chief object, for that victory was gained the day of the meeting of the Vestry, on the 2nd. The expression of the opinion and still more, the significant silence of that Vestry, must prevail against any opposition, and the pamphlet is hardly needed to complete the victory. The main object of the publication is to win another battle, that of toleration; to enable Christians of a different stamp from Huron Christians to build and endow churches of their own, where the doctrines of the Church of England can be heard according to her Prayer Book, after the manner the Church has permitted since the Reformation in every diocese in England. This battle we are determined to win, and the first step necessary is to show to the world the kind of man who rules over this diocese, and hinders us from obtaining our just rights—a man who scruples not to say whatever will advance his views, and hesitates not, as I have fully shown in this pamphlet, by irresistible evidence, to influence his hearers by any statement, however devoid of truth, which will, as he thinks, gain a momentary advantage. I have no doubt that he thought nothing more would ever be heard of the statements at the Vestry Meeting, that the command he and his friends have of the press of this city, would prevent the extension of the publication of the proceedings beyond the walls of the School-house, or at furthest, of the city itself. But, in order to gain the important object of those who entered into this warfare, these proceedings must be known everywhere. We must expose the man for the gain of the Church.

Who can contemplate, without disgust, the present condition of the Church of England in this diocese, under such a ruler, or its future without dismay, if he can only continue his rule a few years longer, until the system of teaching in this diocese becomes thoroughly grafted into the country, by the ordination of men trained in his views, educated at narrow sectarian seminaries, dignified with the title of Colleges, but intended to inculcate one sided notions of Church of England Christianity. Colleges which take pupils of mature age from the lower classes of the community, because the cheapness of the education tempts such men away from their proper sphere, into one for which by all their previous habits, and manners and ignorance, they are totally unfit. The clergy under such a system are degraded to the level of the masses; not the masses raised to the level of the clergy which should be the object and aim of the training colleges; and by their means the false and narrow views of Christianity now prevalent will be perpetuated.

I do not suppose we can get rid of such a Bishop as easily as we can displace him from an unjust position; but we can by showing the world, what manner of man this is, obtain help from those who can give it, which will procure the alteration of the law, and compel that toleration which will never be otherwise obtained.

I copy the paragraph from the sermon of Mr. Verschoyle, preached at Lambeth, October, 28th, 1857, (which I could not obtain in time for the body of the pamphlet), which is alluded to in a former page. "There is one circumstance in the condition of this infant diocese to which the attention and sympathy of the christian public is earnestly invited; it is that when the endowment had reached the amount of £8,400, and there was every prospect of the proposed £10,000 being realised, together with provision for building an Episcopal residence, a sudden check was given to the effort by the commercial crisis, which has befallen the Canadas, in consequence of their contiguity to, and intercourse with the United States. The result is that the Bishop having vacated the living of London, C.W., with about £1200 per annum, with a suitable residence, has sacrificed £700 a year and a house, and steps into his more responsible office, with the wholly inadequate income of £504 per annum, without a residence. Even this proposed income, too, however inadequate, if reduced, and a portion of the capital jeopardized, by the failure of a gentleman in whose hands it was placed."

It is difficult to say which portion of this paragraph is most erroneous. The Bishop never vacated the residence for one day. He never resigned the living, unless it is intended that it became vacant by the effects of the resolution of the Toronto Synod; but if that is meant, it never was really vacant, for it was well known



that the form of presenting the Bishop to what he was ready to accept, and had never really vacated, and to which the Church Society never formally reappointed him, would be gone through by the Church Society of Huron. He never for one moment possessed the Diocese without a residence, for he has ever refused to do so. The last sentence asserts that the EPISCOPAL income was diminished by somebody's failure; but no old resident of London can tell me the name of the gentleman alluded to. The Bishop in his opening speech, alludes to the loss of RECTORIAL income from failures. Is this a confusion of statement, or did both incomes suffer from the same failure? If so, great misfortunes, unusual in the world, occurred to both incomes, or they suffered from great mismanagement.

I may seem to have expressed myself too strongly and too harshly in this pamphlet, but it must not be forgotten, that there is NOT ONE STATEMENT OF THE BISHOP'S, STRICTLY AND ENTIRELY TRUE, and that it is therefore absolutely necessary, in dealing with one so ready to slip through facts, to speak most plainly. One must grip an eel with a fist full of sand, or it will wriggle away.

At the adjourned Vestry meeting on the 16th April, Mr. Maclean in the Chair, said that he had been requested by the Rector to withdraw the imputation that I did not believe the Athanasian Creed, I replied that I regretted the Rector did not do me that justice on the evening of the last meeting after my repudiation of his imputation, for it was now too late for me to withhold the remarks I had made on that subject as they were already in print. I then moved a resolution that the Vestry no longer pay \$600 towards the salary of the Curate which should be paid by the Rector, as the Rectory funds were ample to meet the duties. The resolution was carried unanimously. The minutes of the meeting of the 2nd, were read, but I think it will hardly be credited that nothing appeared in them but Mr. Shaw's resolution. All that is related in this pamphlet, so important to the Parish, does not appear in the minutes. I trust that this fact will not be forgotten, if the Vestry records should ever be put in evidence to prove any thing that has occurred in this Parish. No adverse statements, if this is an example of Vestry minutes, will be found in the Vestry Book; and it is no wonder that it has been found quite impossible to dig any satisfactory crop of past transactions out of such unpromising, infertile ground.

This pamphlet will accomplish one good object if it helps to convince mankind of one fact daily becoming more and more clear to all observant persons. THAT THE FRUIT OF EVANGELICAL CONVERSION IS WANT OF TRUTH.



## APPENDIX.

---

I received the following letter too late to print it in its proper place (page 28). I am therefore obliged to append it to the pamphlet. It will be found to confirm all I have said regarding the Bishop of Michigan, and completely convict the Bishop of Huron of one of those half-truths I have so strongly condemned. H.L.

DETROIT, April 18, 1866.

DEAR SIR,

I received your letter and give you an answer, with great pleasure, to the question presented to me. When I was elected as the Bishop of Michigan, there was no Episcopal Fund, and as St. Paul's Church, Detroit, was the largest congregation, I was elected as the Rector of the Church. This was done to give me a salary for my support. Whenever the Episcopal Fund was thought to be sufficient for that purpose, I resigned the Rectorship and all the emoluments connected with it. A new Rector was called, and the whole salary which I had, and more, was given to and is now enjoyed by him. My only support is drawn from the Episcopal Fund. I also gave up the Rectory, which is now and has been, from the time of my resignation, in the possession of the Rector of the Church.

With much respect, &c., &c.

SAMUEL A. McCOSKEY.

HENRY LANDOR, ESQ.

I have been thinking of you for some time  
and wondering how you are getting on.  
I hope you are well and happy.  
I have been thinking of you for some time  
and wondering how you are getting on.  
I hope you are well and happy.

I have been thinking of you for some time  
and wondering how you are getting on.  
I hope you are well and happy.  
I have been thinking of you for some time  
and wondering how you are getting on.  
I hope you are well and happy.  
I have been thinking of you for some time  
and wondering how you are getting on.  
I hope you are well and happy.

I have been thinking of you for some time  
and wondering how you are getting on.  
I hope you are well and happy.

I have been thinking of you for some time  
and wondering how you are getting on.  
I hope you are well and happy.

I have been thinking of you for some time  
and wondering how you are getting on.  
I hope you are well and happy.

## MINISTERS' WIDOWS' AND ORPHANS' FUND.

### *Congregational Collections.*

Sterling, per Rev. A. Buchan, \$9.00; S. Louis de Gouzaque, per Rev. J. T. Paul, \$4.00; Galt, per Rev. R. Campbell, \$20.00; Kingston, per Rev. W. M. Inglis, \$68.00; Arthur, per Rev. J. White, \$6.00; Litchfield, per Rev. D. McDonald, \$4.70; Eldon, per Rev. A. McPherson, \$14.00; Huntly, per Rev. J. Sinclair, \$7.00; North Williamsburgh, per Rev. J. Davidson, for 1864 and 1865, \$24.00; Ottawa, per Wm. Hamilton, Esq., \$31.00; Ramsay, per Rev. J. McMurray, \$14.00; Chatham, C. E., per — Cushing, Esq., \$6.00; Guelph, per Rev. J. Hogg, \$24.00; Kincardine, per Rev. A. Dowson, \$5.00; Smith's Falls, per Rev. S. Mylne, \$4.00; Darlington, per Rev. J. McKerras, \$9.00; Ramsay, additional from a Friend, per Rev. J. McMorine, \$5.00; Whitby, per Rev. K. MacLennan, \$10.75; Hemmingford, per Rev. J. Patterson, \$12.00; Point St. Charles, per Rev. W. Darraach, \$12.23; Melbourne, per Rev. T. G. Smith, \$55.00. Total, \$344.78.

Montreal, 17th March, 1865.

ARCHIBALD FERGUSON, *Treasurer*.

---

## FRENCH MISSION FUND.

### *Congregational Collection.*

Sterling, per Rev. A. Buchan, \$6.00; Ramsay, per Rev. J. McMorine, \$10.00. Total, \$16.00.

Montreal, 17th March, 1865.

ARCHIBALD FERGUSON, *Treasurer*.

---

## BURSARY SCHEME.

### *Congregational Collection.*

Beckwith, per Rev. M. Ross, \$6.00; Arnprior, per Rev. P. Lindsay, \$5.50; King, per Rev. J. Tawse, 1.00; Williamstown, \$5.00; Cumberland and Buckingham, per Rev. J. Smith, \$16.00; Lindsay, per Rev. J. B. Muir, \$4; Perth, per Rev. W. Bain, \$25.00; Cornwall, per Rev. Dr. Urquhart, \$35.00; Donation from Rev. Henry Gill, agent British and Foreign Bible Society, \$5.00. Total, \$105.50.

Kingston, 13th March, 1865.

JOHN PATON, *Treasurer*.

---

## HOME MISSION ENDOWMENT FUND.

Thorah, per Rev. D. Watson, \$336.00.

J. W. COOK, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

# STEAMSHIP COMPANY

UNDER **CONTRACT** WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA  
For the CONVEYANCE of the

## CANADIAN AND UNITED STATES MAIL

1864-5. **WINTER ARRANGEMENTS.** 1864--5.

PASSENGERS BOOKED TO LONDONDERRY, AND LIVERPOOL.

**RETURN TICKETS GRANTED AT REDUCED RATES**

This Company's MAIL LINE is composed of the undernoted First-Class, Full-Powered, Compound Built, Double-Engine Iron Steamships:

HIBERNIAN .....	2434	Tons.....	Capt. DUTTON.
NOVA-SCOTIAN .....	2300	" .....	Capt. WYLIE.
NORTH-AMERICAN.....	1784	" .....	Capt. KERR.
DAMASCUS.....	1300	" .....	Capt. WATT.
BELGIAN.....	2434	" .....	Capt. BROWN.
PERUVIAN .....	2600	" .....	Capt. BALLANTINE.
MORAVIAN.....	2650	" .....	Capt. AITON.

**SAILING FROM LIVERPOOL EVERY THURSDAY**

AND

**FROM PORTLAND EVERY SATURDAY,**

Calling at LOUGH FOYLE to receive on board and land Mails and Passengers to and from Londonderry.

AND THEIR

**GLASGOW LINE  OF STEAMSHIPS**

ST. GEORGE.....	1468	Tons.....	Capt. SMITH.
ST. ANDREW.....	1432	" .....	Capt. SCOTT.
ST. PATRICK .....	1207	" .....	Capt. TROCKS.
ST. DAVID.....	1600	" .....	Capt. AIRD.

**SAILING BETWEEN THE CLYDE AND PORTLAND AND NEW YORK**

At intervals throughout the season of winter navigation.

The Steamers of the MAIL LINE are intended to be despatched from Portland at the undernoted:

ST. DAVID,	1st April,	1865	MORAVIAN,	22nd April, 1865
DAMASCUS,	8th "	1865	BELGIAN,	29th " 1865
NOVA SCOTIAN,	15th "	1865		

RATES of THROUGH PASSAGE from MONTREAL TO LONDONDERRY, or LIVERPOOL

CABIN...\$72 to 85. { According to accommodation. } STEERAGE.....\$34.

**AN EXPERIENCED SURGEON CARRIED ON BOARD EACH VESSEL.**

Berths not secured until paid for. For Freight or other particulars, apply to

**H. & A. ALLAN,**  
Corner of Youville and Common Streets,  
MONTREAL.





